

## Reference Groups, Membership Groups, and Attitude Change<sup>1</sup>

Alberta Engvall Siegel and Sidney Siegel

In social psychological theory, it has long been recognized that an individual's *membership groups* have an important influence on the values and attitudes he holds. More recently, attention has also been given to the influence of his *reference groups*: the groups in which he aspires to attain or maintain membership. In a given area, membership groups and reference groups may or may not be identical. They are identical when the person aspires to *maintain* membership in the group of which he is a part; they are disparate when the group in which the individual aspires to *attain* membership is one in which he is not a member. It has been widely asserted that both membership and reference groups affect the attitudes held by the individual (4).

The present study is an examination of the attitude changes which occur over time when reference groups and membership groups are identical and when they are disparate. The study takes advantage of a field experiment which occurred in the social context of the lives of the subjects, concerning events considered vital by them. The subjects were not aware that their membership and reference groups were of research interest; in fact, they did not know that the relevant information about these was available to the investigators.

The field experiment permitted a test of the general hypothesis that both the amount and the direction of a person's attitude change over time depends on the attitude norms of his membership group (whether or not that group is chosen by him) and on the attitude norms of his reference group.

This hypothesis is tested with subjects who shared a common reference group at the time of the initial assessment of attitudes. They were then

From *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1957, 55, 360-364. Reprinted by permission of the authors and the American Psychological Association. The study was supported by grants from the Committee for the Study of American Values at Stanford University and from the Stanford Value Theory Project.

randomly assigned to alternative membership groups, some being assigned to the chosen group and others to a nonchosen group. Attitudes were reassessed after a year of experience in these alternative membership groups with divergent attitude norms. During the course of the year, some subjects came to take the imposed (initially nonpreferred) membership group as their reference group. Attitude change after the year was examined in terms of the membership group and reference group identifications of the subjects at that time.

### The Field Experiment

The subjects of this study were women students at a large private co-educational university. The study was initiated shortly before the end of their freshman year, when they all lived in the same large freshman dormitory to which they had been assigned upon entering the university. At this university, all women move to new housing for their sophomore year. Several types of housing are available to them: a large dormitory, a medium-sized dormitory, several very small houses which share common dining facilities, and a number of former sorority houses which have been operated by the university since sororities were banished from the campus. These latter are located among the fraternity houses on Fraternity Row, and are therefore known as "Row houses." Although the Row houses are lower in physical comfort than most of the other residences for women, students consider them higher in social status. This observation was confirmed by a poll of students (5, 205), in which over 90 per cent of the respondents stated that Row houses for women were higher in social status than non-Row houses, the remaining few disclaiming any information concerning status differences among women's residences.

In the Spring of each year, a "drawing" is held for housing for the subsequent year. All freshmen must participate in this drawing, and any other student who wishes to change her residence may participate. It is conducted by the office of the Dean of Women, in cooperation with woman student leaders. Any participant's ballot is understood to be secret. The woman uses the ballot to rank the houses in the order of her preference. After submitting this ballot, she draws a number from the hopper. The rank of that number determines the likelihood that her preference will be satisfied.

In research reported earlier (5), a random sample was drawn from the population of freshman women at this university, several tests were administered to the persons in that sample, and (unknown to the subjects) their housing preferences for the forthcoming sophomore year were observed by the investigator. The subjects were characterized as "high status

oriented" if they listed a Row house as their first choice, and were characterized as "low status oriented" if they listed a non-Row house as their first choice. The hypothesis under test, drawn from reference group theory and from theoretical formulations concerning authoritarianism, was that high status orientation is a correlate of authoritarianism. The hypothesis was confirmed: freshman women who listed a Row house as their first choice for residence scored significantly higher on the average in authoritarianism, as measured by the E-F scale (1, 2) than did women who listed a non-Row house as their first choice. The present study is a continuation of the one described, and uses as its subjects only those members of the original sample who were "high status oriented," i.e., preferred to live in a Row house for the sophomore year. In the initial study (5), of the 95 subjects whose housing choices were listed, 39 were "high status oriented," i.e., demonstrated that the Row was their reference group by giving a Row house as their first choice in the drawing. Of this group, 28 were available to serve as subjects for the follow-up or "change" study which is the topic of the present paper. These women form a homogeneous subsample in that at the conclusion of their freshman year they shared a common membership group (the freshman dormitory) and a common reference group (the Row). These subjects, however, had divergent experiences during their sophomore year: nine were Row residents during that year (having drawn sufficiently small numbers in the housing drawing to enable them to be assigned to the group of their choice) and the other 19 lived in non-Row houses during that year (having drawn numbers too large to enable them to be assigned to the housing group of their choice).

E-F scores were obtained from each of the 28 subjects in the course of a large-scale testing program administered to most of the women students at the university. Anonymity was guaranteed to the participants, but a coding procedure permitted the investigators to identify each respondent and thereby to isolate the subjects and compare each subjects' second E-F score with her first.

To prevent the women from knowing that they were participating in a follow-up study, several procedures were utilized: (a) many persons who had not served in the earlier study were included in the second sample, (b) the testing was introduced as being part of a nation-wide study to establish norms, (c) the test administrators were different persons from those who had administered the initial tests, (d) persons who informed the test administrator that they had already taken the "Public Opinion Questionnaire" (E-F scale) were casually told that this did not disqualify them from participating in the current study.

The women had no hint that the research was in any way related to their housing arrangements. Testing was conducted in classrooms as well

as in residences, and all procedures and instructions were specifically designed to avoid any arousal of the salience of the housing groups in the frame of reference of the research.

The annual housing drawing was conducted three weeks after the sophomore-year testing, and, as usual, each woman's housing ballot was understood to be secret. In this drawing, each subject had the opportunity to change her membership group, although a residence move is not required at the end of the sophomore year as it is at the end of the freshman year. If a subject participated in this drawing, the house which she listed as her first choice on the ballot was identified by the investigators as her reference group. If she did not, it was evident that the house in which she was currently a member was the one in which she chose to continue to live, i.e., was her reference group. With the information on each participant's residence choice at the end of her freshman year, her assigned residence for her sophomore year, and her residence choice at the end of her sophomore year, it was possible to classify the subjects in three categories:

- A. Women ( $n = 9$ ) who had gained assignment to live on the Row during their sophomore year and who did not attempt to draw out of the Row at the end of that year;
- B. Women ( $n = 11$ ) who had not gained assignment to a Row house for the sophomore year and who drew for a Row house again after living in a non-Row house during the sophomore year; and
- C. Women ( $n = 8$ ) who had not gained assignment to a Row house for the sophomore year, and who chose to remain in a non-Row house after living in one during the sophomore year.

For all three groups of subjects, as we have pointed out, membership group (freshman dormitory) and reference group (Row house) were common at the end of the freshman year. For Group A, membership and reference groups were identical throughout the sophomore year. For Group B, membership and reference groups were disparate throughout the sophomore year. For Group C, membership and reference groups were initially disparate during the sophomore year but became identical because of a change in reference groups.

As will be demonstrated, the Row and the non-Row social groups differ in attitude norms, with Row residents being generally more authoritarian than non-Row residents. From social psychological theory concerning the influence of group norms on individuals' attitudes, it would be predicted that the different group identifications during the sophomore year of the three groups of subjects would result in differential attitude change. Those who gained admittance to a Row house for the sophomore year (Group A) would be expected to show the least change in authoritarianism, for they spent that year in a social context which

reinforced their initial attitudes. Group C members would be expected to show the greatest change in authoritarianism, a change associated not only with their membership in a group (the non-Row group) which is typically low in authoritarianism, but also with their shift in reference groups, from Row to non-Row, i.e., from a group normatively higher in authoritarianism to a group normatively lower. The extent of attitude change in the members of Group B would be expected to be intermediate, due to the conflicting influences of the imposed membership group (non-Row) and of the unchanged reference group (Row). The research hypothesis, then, is that between the time of the freshman-year testing and the sophomore-year testing, the extent of change in authoritarianism will be least in Group A, greater in Group B, and greatest in Group C. That is, in extent of attitude change, Group A < Group B < Group C.

### Results

*Group norms.* From the data collected in the large-scale testing program, it was possible to determine the group norms for authoritarian attitudes among the Row and the non-Row women at the university. The

TABLE 1

FREQUENCIES OF E-F SCORES ABOVE AND BELOW COMMON MEDIAN FOR ROW AND NON-ROW RESIDENTS

|              | RESIDENTS<br>OF NON-ROW<br>HOUSES | RESIDENTS<br>OF ROW<br>HOUSES | TOTAL |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| Above Median | 36                                | 166                           | 202   |
| Below Median | 65                                | 137                           | 202   |
| Total        | 101                               | 303                           | 404   |

E-F scale was administered to all available Row residents ( $n = 303$ ) and to a random sample of residents of non-Row houses ( $n = 101$ ). These women were sophomores, juniors, and seniors. The mean E-F score of the Row women was 90, while the mean E-F score of the non-Row was 81. The E-F scores of the two groups were demonstrated to differ at the  $p < .001$  level ( $\chi^2 = 11.1$ ) by the median test (6, 111-116), a non-parametric test, the data for which are shown in Table 1.

*Attitude change.* The central hypothesis of this study is that attitude change will occur differentially in Groups A, B, and C, and that it will occur in the direction which would be predicted from knowledge of the group norms among Row and non-Row residents in general. The 28 subjects of this study had a mean E-F score of 102 at the end of their fresh-

man year. The data reported above concerning authoritarianism norms for all women residing on campus would lead to the prediction that in general the subjects would show a reduction in authoritarianism during the sophomore year but that this reduction would be differential in the three groups; from the knowledge that Row residents generally are higher in authoritarianism than non-Row residents, the prediction based on social group theory would be that Group A would show the smallest reduction in authoritarianism scores, Group B would show a larger reduction, and Group C would show the largest reduction. The data which permit a test of this hypothesis are given in Table 2. The Jonck-

TABLE 2

FRESHMAN-YEAR AND SOPHOMORE-YEAR E-F SCORES OF SUBJECTS

| GROUP | E-F SCORE               |                          | DIFFERENCE |
|-------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------|
|       | End of<br>Freshman Year | End of<br>Sophomore Year |            |
| A     | 108                     | 125                      | -17        |
|       | 70                      | 78                       | -8         |
|       | 106                     | 107                      | -1         |
|       | 92                      | 92                       | 0          |
|       | 80                      | 78                       | 2          |
|       | 104                     | 102                      | 2          |
|       | 143                     | 138                      | 5          |
|       | 110                     | 92                       | 18         |
| B     | 114                     | 80                       | 34         |
|       | 76                      | 117                      | -41        |
|       | 105                     | 107                      | -2         |
|       | 88                      | 82                       | 6          |
|       | 109                     | 97                       | 12         |
|       | 98                      | 83                       | 15         |
|       | 112                     | 94                       | 18         |
|       | 101                     | 82                       | 19         |
|       | 114                     | 93                       | 21         |
|       | 104                     | 81                       | 23         |
|       | 116                     | 91                       | 25         |
| C     | 101                     | 74                       | 27         |
|       | 121                     | 126                      | -5         |
|       | 87                      | 79                       | 8          |
|       | 105                     | 95                       | 10         |
|       | 97                      | 81                       | 16         |
|       | 96                      | 78                       | 18         |
|       | 108                     | 73                       | 35         |
|       | 114                     | 77                       | 37         |
|       | 88                      | 49                       | 39         |

heere test (3), a nonparametric  $k$ -sample test which tests the null hypothesis that the three groups are from the same population against the alternative hypothesis that they are from different populations which are ordered in a specified way, was used with these data. By that test, the hypothesis is confirmed at the  $p < .025$  level.

### Discussion

Substantively, the present study provides experimental verification of certain assertions in social group theory, demonstrating that attitude change over time is related to the group identification of the person—both his membership group identification and his reference group identification. The hypothesis that extent of attitude change would be different in the three subgroups of subjects, depending on their respective membership group and reference group identifications, is confirmed at the  $p < .025$  level; in extent of change in authoritarianism, Group A < Group B < Group C, as predicted.

Another way of looking at the data may serve to highlight the influence of membership groups and reference groups. At the end of the freshman year, the members of Groups A, B, and C shared the same membership group and the same reference group. During the sophomore year, those in Group A shared one membership group while those in Groups B and C together shared another. From membership group theory, it would be predicted that the extent of attitude change would be greater among the latter subjects. This hypothesis is supported by the data (in Table 2): by the Mann-Whitney test (6, 116–127), the change scores of these two sets of subjects (Group A versus Groups B and C together) differ in the predicted direction at the  $p < .025$  level. This finding illustrates the influence of *membership* groups on attitude change. On the other hand, at the conclusion of the sophomore year, the women in Groups A and B shared a common reference group while those in Group C had come to share another. From reference group theory, it would be predicted that attitude change would be more extensive among the subjects who had changed reference groups (Group C) than among those who had not. This hypothesis is also supported by the data (in Table 2): by the Mann-Whitney test, the change scores of these two sets of subjects (Groups A and B together versus Group C) differ in the predicted direction at the  $p < .05$  level. This finding illustrates the influence of *reference* groups on attitude change. Any inference from this mode of analysis (as contrasted with the main analysis of the data, by the Jonckheere test) must be qualified because of the nonindependence of the data on which the two Mann-Whitney tests are made, but it is men-

tioned here to clarify the role which membership and reference groups play in influencing attitude change.

The findings may also contribute to our understanding of processes affecting attitude change. The imposition of a membership group does have some effect on an individual's attitudes, even when the imposed group is not accepted by the individual as his reference group. This relationship is shown in the case of Group B. If the person comes to accept the imposed group as his reference group, as was the case with the persons in Group C, then the change in his attitudes toward the level of the group norm is even more pronounced.

Methodologically, the study has certain features which may deserve brief mention. First, the study demonstrates that it is possible operationally to define the concept of reference group. The act of voting by secret ballot for the group in which one would like to live constitutes clear behavioral specification of one's reference group, and it is an act whose conceptual meaning can be so directly inferred that there is no problem of reliability of judgment in its categorization by the investigator. Second, the study demonstrates that a field study can be conducted which contains the critical feature of an experiment that is usually lacking in naturalistic situations: randomization. The determination of whether or not a woman student would be assigned to the living group of her choice was based on a random event: the size of the number she drew from the hopper. This fact satisfied the requirement that the treatment condition be randomized, and permitted sharper inferences than can usually be drawn from field studies. Third, the test behavior on which the conclusions of this study were based occurred in a context in which the salience of membership and reference groups was *not* aroused, and in which no external sanctions from the relevant groups were operative. This feature of the design permitted the interpretation that the E-F scores represented the participant's internalized attitudes (4, 218). Finally, the use of a paper-and-pencil measure of attitude and thus of attitude change, rather than the use of some more behavioral measure, is a deficiency of the present study. Moreover, the measure which was used suffers from a well-known circularity, based on the occurrence of pseudo-low scores (1, 771; 5, 221–222).

### Summary

In the social context of the lives of the subjects, and in a natural social experiment which provided randomization of the relevant condition effects, the influence of both membership and reference groups on attitude change was assessed. All subjects shared a common reference group

at the start of the period of the study. When divergent membership groups with disparate attitude norms were socially imposed on the basis of a random event, attitude change in the subjects over time was a function of the normative attitudes of both imposed membership groups and the individuals' reference groups. The greatest attitude change occurred in subjects who came to take the imposed, initially nonpreferred, membership group as their reference group.

#### REFERENCES

1. Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper, 1950.
2. Gough, H. G. Studies of social intolerance: I. Some psychological and sociological correlates of anti-Semitism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1951, 33, 237-246.
3. Jonckheere, A. R. A distribution-free k-sample test against ordered alternatives. *Biometrika*, 1954, 41, 133-145.
4. Sherif, M., & Sherif, Carolyn W. *Groups in harmony and tension*. New York: Harper, 1953.
5. Siegel, S. Certain determinants and correlates of authoritarianism. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1954, 49, 187-229.
6. Siegel, S. *Nonparametric statistics: For the behavioral sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.